

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/753,727	01/03/2001	Rosario Gennaro	RSW920000091US1	3760	
7.	590 05/27/2005		EXAMINER		
Gerald R. Woods			HENNING, MATTHEW T		
IBM Corporation P.O. Box 1219:			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Research Trian	gle Park, NC 27709		2131		
			DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/753,727 GENNARO, ROSARIO		RIO				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Matthew T. Henning	2131					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 May 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the folking places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comprocessing time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in oliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	, which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any each Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal (of the appeal.				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); atter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re 116 and 41.33(a)).	TE below); educing or simplifying jected claims.	the issues for				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	5):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wovided below or appended.	rill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: 5,6,17,18,29 and 30. Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,9-19,21-32,34-37,39-45 and 47. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8,20,33,38 and 4 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<u>46</u> .						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 			ince because:				
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other 	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The independent claims as amended would present groups of limitations that were not presented together previously. For example, independent claim 1 as amended would contain the limitations of dependent claims 4 and 5, which were not previously presented together. Similarly, independent claims 13, 25, and 39 as amended would have the same issue. Furthermore, claim 47 depends from the canceled claim 46.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument's are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that Patel did not disclose a C-bit input value as an exponent of the one-way function, but instead an n-bit input is not found persuasive. Page 313, section 5 line 10 was used to show that the output of the generator was $(n-\omega(\log n))$ bits long. Page 314, Section 5.1 shows that the input exponent when using short exponents was $\omega(\log n)$ bits, or "C" bits. Applicant's other argument, that Patel did not disclose a "fixed generator value". Patel disclosed that 'g' is a generator (See Patel Page 304 Section 1 Lines 3-4) and nowhere in the document does Patel disclose changing 'g'. Therefore, 'g' is a "fixed generator value". As such the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive and therefore maintains the final rejection dated 3/4/2005.

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100